

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This paper is in response to the Office Action mailed July 14, 2005. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claim 26 has been canceled in view of the Examiner remarks.

Applicants enclose a Third Declaration Under Rule 132. This declaration is provided in response to the arguments in ¶ 7 of the Official Action. The declaration merely clarifies the previous evidence, and states that the composites described in the declaration have the same thicknesses of layers and the same materials, and the same processing conditions. Accordingly, they are a fair comparison. It is further pointed out that in the examples in the application that did not include a second layer, the substrate layer was thicker so that the total thickness of the composite was the same. (See Table 1).

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 5-7, 9, 11-18 and 20-26 under 35 USC § 103 based on the combination of MacGregor and Susi and says again that the evidence submitted is not commensurate in scope with the claims.

As a first matter, Applicants submit that this reason for finding the evidence to be insufficient fails to take into consideration the specific limitations of claims 24 and 25. Claim 24 limits the cycloaliphatic polyester to PCCD, and because it is dependent on claim 23 the UV absorber to one that is "a low volatility hydroxyphenyl-triazine or -pyrimidine UV absorber that contains a 2,4,6-trisaryl-1,3,5-triazine moiety and a free hydroxyl group, or that contains a 2,4,6-trisaryl-1,3-pyrimidine moiety and a free hydroxyl group or a mixture thereof. The PCCD is the cycloaliphatic polyester used in the examples, and the UV absorber employed in the examples is one that is a mixture of the two components names in claim 23. Claim 25 specifically claims PCCD and the UV absorber mixture as used in the Examples. The examiner has not explained how these claims fall outside the scope of the evidence.

Furthermore, the Examiner's argument concerning the sufficiency of the evidence is one that is based entirely on an assertion that the declaration is narrow in scope. The examiner has not offered any comparison of the materials used in the application and declaration examples to other materials that the claims might encompass, nor any reasons why the person skilled in the art would not find it reasonable that the results can be extended.

In this regard, it is further submitted that Applicants have tested the materials from the closest prior art. The Examiner has attempted to shift the burden to Applicants to test additional, but unidentified materials. Applicants submit this shift on the present record is improper, and represents a potentially never-ending process. Should the Examiner identify what other materials would fall within the scope of the claims, and which it is alleged that the materials tested are not reasonably representative, then Applicants could fairly respond through providing additional examples directed to this material or arguments as to why the position that PCCD is not representative is considered to be in error. As it is, since Applicants have no idea what other

materials the Examiner is focusing on, they cannot provide evidence that PCCD is representative. The Examiner failed to respond to a request for such information that was presented in the last response, and therefore Applicants submit that this rejection should be withdrawn as unsupported in the record.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that all of the claims of this application are in form for allowance. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,



Marina T. Larson Ph.D.  
PTO Reg. No. 32,038  
Attorney for Applicant  
(970) 468-6600

Enclosures